

Small Josephson current and product deduced by means of measurement for an inhomogeneous superconductor: Extension of the Ambegaokar - Baratoff theory

Hyun-Tak Kim (htkim@etri.re.kr, kimht45@hotmail.com)
Telecom. Basic Research Lab., ETRI, Daejeon 305-350, Korea

For an inhomogeneous high- T_c superconductor, band-filling dependence of Josephson current and Josephson product is deduced at $T=0$ K by means of measurement; this is an extension of Ambegaokar - Baratoff Josephson current and product. The observed Josephson current, J_{obs} , is given by $J_{obs} = \rho J_i$, where $0 < \rho \leq 1$ is band filling (or local density). When $\rho=1$, $J_{obs} = J_i$ is the intrinsic supercurrent occurring by Cooper pair. When $0 < \rho < 1$, J_{obs} is an average of J_i over the measurement region and is the effect of measurement. The observed Ambegaokar - Baratoff Josephson product, based on the s -wave theory, is given by $J_{obs} R_n = \frac{\pi}{2} \rho \Delta_i$, where Δ_i is the intrinsic superconducting gap and small, which results in small Josephson products observed by the experiments. The intrinsic gap, $4 < \Delta_i < 10$ meV, is analyzed from the Josephson-product data of $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$. In addition, the triple- π -junction experiments, observing the half-flux quantum ($\Phi_0/2$) as evidence of d -wave symmetry, are discussed by using means of measurement. Comments on a flux trap of the magnetic modulation experiment using Pb-YBCO dc SQUIDS are also given. Author's thought is given on the angle dependence of J_c measured in whisker.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Fg, 74.50.+r

From the discovery of a high- T_c superconductor until recently, pairing symmetry for the mechanism of high- T_c superconductivity has been controversial because intrinsic physical information of superconductors is not obtained for intrinsically inhomogeneous superconductors¹⁻⁵ with a metal phase and an insulator phase with the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave symmetry.⁶ The intrinsic inhomogeneity in which a homogeneous metal region is about $14\text{\AA}$ was revealed by scanning tunnelling microscopy.¹ Moreover, as another evidence of the inhomogeneity, coexistence of the superconducting gap and the pseudo-gap was observed.^{7,8} The inhomogeneity is due to the metal-insulator instability.⁵ In inhomogeneous superconductors, the fact that the energy gap decreases with an increasing local density was also revealed by experiments¹⁻⁴ and a theoretical consideration⁶. Recently, for an inhomogeneous superconductor, an analysis method for the intrinsic density of states^{9,10} and the intrinsic superconducting gap⁶ was developed by means of measurement. The method disclosed the identity of gap anisotropy and revealed that pairing symmetry of a high- T_c superconductor is an s -wave.⁶

However, there are still two unsolved problems to be clarified. One is that the Josephson product decreases with an increasing superconducting gap.¹¹ This also creates a problem in determining the extent of the s -wave component in $s + d$ mixed pair states. Many investigations indicated that the Josephson product in c -axis Josephson pair (or intrinsic Josephson) tunneling experiments is much smaller than the all- s -wave Ambegaokar-Baratoff limit.¹²⁻²⁰ On the basis of this experimental result, it has been interpreted that the ratio of the s -wave component to the full d -wave one in the $s+d$ mixed states is very small.

The other problem is a doping dependence of the Josephson supercurrent for inhomogeneous superconductors. Tsuei *et al.*²¹⁻²³ and Sugimoto *et al.*²⁴ observed

the half flux quantum as evidence of the d -wave symmetry for a thin film deposited on a tricrystal substrate. However, this result was analyzed by assuming that the films are homogeneous superconductors. Related to pairing symmetry, the problems are very important for the mechanism of high- T_c superconductivity.

In this paper, we deduced band-filling (or doping) dependence of the Josephson supercurrent and the Josephson product at $T=0$ K, by using the means of measurement suggested in a previous paper^{6,9}; this is an extension of Ambegaokar - Baratoff Josephson current and product. In addition, the triple- π -junction experiments for observing the half-flux quantum are discussed by using a Josephson current developed here. Comments on flux trap of the magnetic modulation experiment using Pb-YBCO dc SQUIDS are also given.

Fractional charge has been demonstrated in previous papers.^{6,9} These will be reviewed briefly. When an inhomogeneous superconductor with two phases of a metal region and an insulating region⁶ is measured, carriers in the metal region are averaged over lattices (or atoms) in the entire measurement region, including the two-phase regions. The metal region has the electronic structure of *one electron per atom*. Then the inhomogeneous superconductor is changed into a homogeneous one with the electronic structure of *one effective charge per atom*.

The observed effective charge becomes $e' = \rho e$, where $0 < \rho = n/l \leq 1$ is band filling, n is the number of carriers in the metal region, and l is the number of total lattices in the measurement region. The fractional effective charge is justified only when the inhomogeneous system is measured. Otherwise, it becomes true charge in the metal region (see reference 9). By using the fractional charge, in an inhomogeneous superconductor, the observed energy gap, Δ , was given by

$$\Delta = \Delta_i / \rho, \quad (1)$$

where Δ_i is the intrinsic superconducting gap determined by the minimum bias voltage. The $0 < \rho \leq 1$ is band filling (local density or inhomogeneous factor), which indicates the extent of the metal region.⁶ The validity of Eq. (1) was given by many tunneling experiments.⁶

Ambegaokar and Baratoff²⁵ derived the Josephson tunnelling supercurrent on the basis of BCS theory for an s -wave homogeneous superconductor. The supercurrent at $T=0$ K was given by

$$J = \frac{\pi}{2} R_n^{-1} \Delta, \quad (2)$$

where $R_n = (2\pi\hbar/e^2T)$, T is the tunneling matrix, and Δ is a superconducting energy gap.

In an inhomogeneous superconductor, the averaged metallic system has the electronic structure of one effective charge per atom, which is mathematically equivalent to the electronic structure of the metal used in the BCS theory. The metal for k -space used in the BCS theory has the electronic structure of one electron per atom. The Josephson current and product derived in the Ambegaokar and Baratoff theory can be used without formula's change even in the inhomogeneous superconductor by replacing true charge by the effective charge because the averaged effective charge is invariant under transformation. In addition, a similar calculation has been given when the Brinkman-Rice picture was extended (see reference 9). Thus, the observed supercurrent, J_{obs} , is given by substituting e in R_n and Δ with $e' = \rho e$ and $\Delta = \Delta_i/\rho$ by

$$J_{obs} \equiv \left(\frac{e^2 T}{4\hbar}\right) \rho \Delta_i = \rho J_i, \quad (3)$$

where J_i is the intrinsic supercurrent. The observed Josephson product is also given by using Eq. (3) by

$$J_{obs} R_n \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \rho^2 \Delta_{obs} \equiv \frac{\pi}{2} \rho \Delta_i = \rho J_i R_n, \quad (4)$$

where Δ_i is constant.

When $\rho = 1$, Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) are the intrinsic supercurrent and the intrinsic product (or Ambegaokar and Baratoff product) occurring by true charges, respectively. When $0 < \rho < 1$, the equations correspond to the averages of the intrinsic supercurrent and the intrinsic product over the measurement region and are the effect of measurement. Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) are the extended Ambegaokar - Baratoff Josephson current and product, respectively.

The Josephson current and the Josephson product decrease with decreasing ρ . This explains the fact that the observed Josephson product decreases with an increasing energy gap.¹¹ The ρ dependence in Eq. (4) comes from Eq. (3), which agrees with a result observed by the intrinsic Josephson junction.¹⁷ Note that the magnitude of the intrinsic product is basically very small because Δ_i is small. Considering that the anisotropy of the number of carriers in the c -axis and ab -plane is large

($\rho_{c-axis} \ll \rho_{ab-plane}$), the product observed in the c -axis is naturally much less than that in the ab -plane. Thus, the observed small Josephson products¹²⁻²⁰ can be explained by Eq. (4). Additionally, for a Josephson junction by two superconductors with different energy gaps, the Josephson product derived by Anderson²⁶ is in the context of the above analysis.

We analyze the intrinsic gap of $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$ from experimental data, using Eq. (4). Irie *et al.*¹⁷ suggested that $I_c R_n \approx 13.3$ meV observed by the intrinsic Josephson junction is $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Ambegaokar-Baratoff product, $I_c R_n \approx 40$ meV, using $\Delta_{obs} \approx 25$ meV and Eq. (4) with $\rho = 1$. The true Ambegaokar-Baratoff product is much less than 40 meV, when both $\rho \neq 1$ and $\Delta_{obs} \neq \Delta_i$ are considered. The intrinsic gap, $\Delta_i \approx 8.5$ meV, is obtained from the observed product, $I_c R_n \approx 13.3$ meV by using Eq. (4) with $\rho = 1$. The true intrinsic gap is slightly larger than 8.5 meV because $\rho < 1$ slightly. Miyakawa *et al.*¹⁴ measured a Josephson-product, $J_{obs} R_n \approx 7$ meV for an over-doped crystal, which can be regarded as $\rho \approx 1$ without a pseudogap²⁷. The intrinsic gap, $\Delta_i = 4 \sim 5$ meV, is obtained by Eq. (4). Mourachkine¹¹ observed the average Josephson product, $I_c R_n \approx 10$ meV, at the minimum energy gap. The intrinsic gap, $\Delta_i \approx 6.4$ meV, is obtained by Eq. (4) with $\rho = 1$. The true intrinsic gap is slightly greater than 6.4 meV because $\rho < 1$ slightly. Thus, we conclude that the analyzed intrinsic gap is in $4 < \Delta_i < 10$ meV.

We apply Eq. (3) to the Josephson- π junction theory.²⁸ The observed circulating current in an inhomogeneous superconducting ring is given when $I_{ij} L > \Phi_0$ without any external field²¹ by

$$I_{obs} \equiv \rho I_i \approx \rho \frac{\Phi_0}{2L}, \quad (5)$$

where $\Phi_0 (= \hbar/2e)$ is the flux quantum and L is a self-inductance of a superconducting ring. When $0 < \rho < 1$, the observed supercurrent, I_{obs} , is an average of the intrinsic supercurrent over the measurement region.

Tsuei *et al.*²¹⁻²³ and Sugimoto *et al.*^{24,29} analyzed the half-flux quantum from a flux observed by a scanning superconducting-quantum-interference-device (SQUID) loop for frustrated (or π loop) $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$ (YBCO) films deposited on a tricrystal substrate, and emphasized the observation of the half-flux quantum as evidence of the d -wave symmetry. However, they did not consider ρ in Eq. (5) in their analysis of the experimental data; they assumed $\rho = 1$. The ρ effect differs from the disorder effect applied by Tsuei *et al.*²¹. We regard the YBCO films as inhomogeneous superconductors of $0 < \rho < 1$. When L , evaluated by Tsuei *et al.*, is used, an intrinsic flux to be evaluated, $\Phi_i/2$, should be larger than $\Phi_0/2$; $\Phi_i = \frac{1}{\rho} \Phi_0 > \Phi_0$.³⁰ When $\Phi_i = \Phi_0$ and $\rho \neq 1$ in Eq. (5), a flux value to be observed should be less than $\Phi_0/2$. The half-flux quantum can be observed only when $\rho = 1$. Note that L is independent of ρ which comes from the supercurrent. In contrast, their analyzed flux values

have a smaller error, $(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1)(\Phi_0/2)$, than the expected intrinsic flux value. To estimate ρ near the triple junction, it is thought that the characteristic of the superconducting ring is not good due to the presence of surface stresses on the substrate at a triple junction which was revealed as either concentrated or deconcentrated^{31,32}. As evidence, the frustrated YBCO film around a triple junction does not show the Meissner effect (expulsion of flux) in Fig. 17 (c) of reference 22. Thus, the inhomogeneity effect cannot be ignored because ρ in the ring is smaller than that at a region away from junctions. The true observed flux is about $\frac{1}{3}\Phi_0$ not $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$, as shown in Fig. 2 (a) of reference 23, which indicates $\rho \neq 1$. Nielsen *et al.*³³ also observed the flux value less than $0.3\Phi_0$ for the paramagnetic Meissner effect (PME; single- π junction) in Nb-Al₂O₃-Nb Josephson-junction arrays, which indicates $\rho \neq 1$. Finally, the intrinsic flux to be evaluated can be regarded as $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$. In addition, Tsuei and Kirtley^{22,34} also measured the half-flux quantum for ring, disk and blanket films.

However, Kirtley *et al.*²³ and Sugimoto *et al.*²⁴ observed the change of flux direction near T_c , which is not explained by the π -junction theory, and also observed in the PME of Ba_{1-x}K_xBiO₃(BKBO)³⁵, Nb³⁶, YBCO³⁷ superconductors. Note that the change of the flux direction indicates that the magnetic property of a superconductor changes from paramagnetic (or ferromagnetic) to diamagnetic. Koblishka *et al.*³⁷ suggested that the PME in an artificial granular YBCO film is attributed to field trapping on the basis of the observation of the upturn near T_c . Nielsen *et al.*³³ and Leo *et al.*³⁸ suggested that the PME can arise from magnetic screening in multiply connected superconductors. These are reasons why we do not think that the observed half flux occurs by the triple- π junctions in the superconducting ring.

We also comment on a flux trap of the magnetic modulation experiment³⁹ using Pb-YBCO dc SQUIDS, on the basis of our observation of the PME for BKBO³⁵. Wollman *et al.*^{39,40} mentioned that the trapping of magnetic vortices is observed in the experiment, but does not affect the corner measurement. Klemm⁴¹ commented on the singular demagnetization effects associated with the corners of very thin samples. We suggest that what has influence on results at the corner measurement is a trapped flux but not its quantity, because the PME is observed although its quantity is very small.³⁵ The flux trap is independent of sample geometry and size and is observed even in grains of a size of $1\mu\text{m}$.³⁵ For a polycrystal and a film, a flux is trapped easily, but comes out easily when an external field disappears. On the contrary, for a high quality single-crystal, it is difficult to trap a flux.³⁵ However, once a flux is trapped even though the quantity is small, the flux remains closed in the crystal even when not in an external field.³⁵ This causes the effect of the π junction, the half flux due to the π -phase shift. Because Wollman's experiments measure minimum resistances (or maximum currents) with varying flux,³⁹ the flux can be

trapped easily into a sample even in a very low field. Note that the superconducting state measuring the maximum currents, as explained in Fig. 1 (b) of reference 39, is not a perfect condensed state; the superconductors do not perfectly shield or expel a flux. Thus, a flux in the YBCO crystal rather than the Pb film can be trapped. This can also account for the minimum current, a small V shape, or the maximum resistance, a small peak, near zero flux for single modulation experiments³⁹. This analysis is different from Wollman *et al.*'s comments⁴⁰. In addition, the PME and the half-flux quantum due to the π -phase shift have been predicted simultaneously in the π -junction theory.^{22,28} Nevertheless, it has been revealed that the PME occurs by a trapped flux³⁵⁻³⁷.

In addition, Klemm⁴² shows that a tightbinding $\xi(k)$, to which the anisotropic extended s -wave order-parameter is applied, fits well into Takano whisker data⁴³ in contrast to Li data⁴⁴. Takano data are the angle dependence of the c -axis Josephson current suggested as evidence of the d -wave symmetry.

This author found that Li's whisker⁴⁴ was annealed in an enough oxygen atmosphere, while Takano's whisker⁴³ in not enough. Li's whisker can be regarded as an overdoped whisker, but Takano's whisker as an under-doped one which can have an insulating phase with a pseudogap. This author wonders whether the angle dependence of $J(\theta)$ measured by Takano *et al.* came from the superconducting phase or the insulating phase. To prove this, whisker should be made in an enough oxygen atmosphere. Then the whisker can show more the intrinsic $J(\theta)$ because an overdoped crystal has only slight or no insulating phase²⁷. Thus, this author thinks that the Li data without the angle dependence of $J(\theta)$ indicating s -wave symmetry is rather intrinsic than the Takano data.

In conclusion, Ambegaokar - Baratoff Josephson current and product were extended. For inhomogeneous high- T_c superconductors, without adding the d -wave theory, Eq. (4) based on the s -wave theory can explain the small Josephson products observed by experiments. Furthermore, the flux-measurement experiments and the flux-modulation experiments are not suited to proving the d -wave symmetry because the perfect elimination of the trapped flux is not possible in the experiments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges R. A. Klemm for his valuable comments.

¹ S. H. Pan, J. P. O'Neel, R. L. Badzey, C. Chamon, H. Ding, J. R. Engelbrecht, Z. Wang, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, A.

- K. Gupta, K.-W. Ng, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, and J. C. Davis, *Nature* 413, 282 (2001).
- ² T. Cren, D. Roditchev, W. Sacks and J. Klein, *Eryophys. Lett.* 54, 84 (2001).
- ³ C. Howald, P. Fournier, and A. Kapitulink, *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 100504 (R) (2001).
- ⁴ K. M. Lang, V. Madhavan, J. E. Hoffman, E. W. Hudson, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, *Nature* 415, 412 (2002).
- ⁵ H.-T. Kim, *Phys. Rev. B* 54, 90 (1996).
- ⁶ H.-T. Kim, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* 71, 2106 (2002); *cond-mat/0203497*.
- ⁷ V. M. Krasnov, A. Yurgens, D. Winkler, P. Delsing, and T. Claeson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 5860 (2000).
- ⁸ N. Miyakawa, J. F. Jasadzinski, M. Asano, D. Henmi, S. Oonuki, K. Sasaki, T. Kaneko, L. Ozyuzer, and K. E. Gray, *Physica C* 357-360, 126 (2001).
- ⁹ H.-T. Kim, *New Trends in Superconductivity* (Ed. J. F. Annet and S. Kruchinin, Kluwer, 2002), NATO Science Series Vol. II/67, p. 137; *cond-mat/0110112*.
- ¹⁰ H.-T. Kim, *Physica C* 341-348, 259 (2000).
- ¹¹ A. Mourachkine, *J. Supercond.* 14, 375 (2001).
- ¹² M. Moessle and R. Kleiner, *Phys. Rev. B* 59, 4486 (1999).
- ¹³ R. Kleiner, M. Moessle, W. Walkenhorst, G. Hechtfisher, K. Schlenga, and P. Mueller, *Physica C* 282-287, 2435 (1997).
- ¹⁴ M. Miyakawa, J. F. Zasadzinski, L. Ozyuzer, P. Gup-tasarma, D. G. Hinks, C. Kendziora, and K. E. Gray, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83, 1018 (1999).
- ¹⁵ L. Ozyuzer, J. F. Zasadzinski, C. Kendziora, and K. E. Gray, *Phys. Rev. B* 61, 3629 (2000).
- ¹⁶ A. Irie and G. Oya, *Physica C* 367, 393 (2002).
- ¹⁷ A. Irie, T. Mimura, M. Okano, and G. Oya, *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* 14, 1097 (2001).
- ¹⁸ R. Kleiner, A. S. Katz, A. G. Sun, R. Summer, D. A. Gajewski, S. H. Han, S. I. Woods, E. Dantsker, B. Chen, K. Chr, M. B. Maple, R. C. Dynes, and J. Clarke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 76, 2161 (1996).
- ¹⁹ A. G. Sun, D. A. Gajewski, M. B. Maple, and R. C. Dynes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72, 2267 (1994).
- ²⁰ H. Arie, K. Yasuda, H. Kobayashi, I. Iguchi, Y. Tanaka, and S. Kashiwaya, *Phys. Rev. B* 62, 11864 (2000).
- ²¹ C.C.Tsuei, J. R. Kirtley, C. C. Chi, L. S. Y. -Jahnes, A. Gupta, T. Shaw, J. Z. Sun, and M. B. Ketchen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73, 593 (1994).
- ²² C.C.Tsuei and J. R. Kirtley *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 72, 969 (2000).
- ²³ J. R. Kirtley, C.C.Tsuei, and K. A. Moler, *Science* 285, 1373 (1999).
- ²⁴ A. Sugimoto, T. Yamaguchi, and I. Iguchi, *Physica C* 367, 28 (2002).
- ²⁵ V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 10, 486 (1963); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 11, 104 (1963) (Erratum).
- ²⁶ P. W. Anderson, *Lectures on the many-Body Problem* (Academic, New York, 1964), p. 113.
- ²⁷ J. L. Tallon and J. W. Loram, *Physica C* 349, 53 (2001).
- ²⁸ M. Sigrist and T. M. Rice, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 61, 4283 (1992).
- ²⁹ I. Iguchi, private communication.
- ³⁰ The flux in the right hand of Eq. (5) is equal to the half-flux quantum observed by experiments; $\rho(\Phi_i/2) = (\Phi_0/2)_{obs}$, where Φ_i is an intrinsic flux to be evaluated and $(\Phi_0/2)_{obs}$ is a value observed by Tsuei *et al.* and Sugimoto *et al.*. Thus $\Phi_i = \frac{1}{\rho}\Phi_0 > \Phi_0$ due to $0 < \rho < 1$.
- ³¹ C. R. Chen, S. X. Li, J. L. Wen, and W. P. Jia, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 282, 170 (2000).
- ³² S. Care and A. Zaoui, *Acta Mater.* 44, 1323 (1996).
- ³³ A. P. Nielsen, A. B. Cawthorne, P. Barbara, F. C. Well-stood, C. J. Lobb, R. S. Newrock, and M. G. Forrester, *Phys. Rev. B* 62, 14380 (2000).
- ³⁴ C.C.Tsuei and J. R. Kirtley, *Physica C* 367, 1 (2002).
- ³⁵ H.-T. Kim, H. Minami, W. Schmidbauer, J. W. Hodby, A. Iyo, F. Iga, and H. Uwe, *J. Low. Tem. Phys.* 105, 557 (1996); *cond-mat/0206432*.
- ³⁶ P. Kostic, B. Veal, A. P. Paulikas, U. Welp, V. R. Todt, C. Gu, U. Geiser, J. M. Williams, K. D. Carlson, and R. A. Klemm, *Phys. Rev. B* 53, 791 (1996).
- ³⁷ M. R. Koblishka, L. Pust, N. Chikumoto, M. Murakami, B. Nilsson, and T. Claeson, *Physica B* 284-288, 599(2000).
- ³⁸ C. D. Leo, G. Rotoli, P. Barbara, A. P. Nielsen, and C. J. Lobb, *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 144518 (2001).
- ³⁹ D. A. Wollman, D. J. Van Harlingen, W. C. Lee, D. M. Ginsberg, and A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 71, 2134 (1993).
- ⁴⁰ D. A. Wollman, D. J. Van Harlingen, and A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73, 1872 (1994).
- ⁴¹ R. A. Klemm, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73, 1871 (1994).
- ⁴² R. A. Klemm, *cond-mat/0211423*.
- ⁴³ Y. Takano, Y. Hatano, M. Ohmori, S. Kawakami, A. Ishii, S. Arisawa, S.-J. Kim, T. Yamashita, K. Togano, and M. Tachiki, *Proceedings of the MOS2002*, to be published.
- ⁴⁴ Q. Li, Y. N. Tsay, M. Suenaga, R. A. Klemm, G. D. Gu, and N. Koshizuka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83, 4160 (1999).